

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/683,685		02/03/2002	Aleksandar Susnjar		3106 EXAMINER	
30379	7590	07/15/2004		EXAM		
ALEKSAN 25 SAINTSI				VERBRUG	GE, KEVIN	
MARKHAM	I, ON L	6C 2H9		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CANADA				2188		
				DATE MAIL ED: 07/15/200	DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/683,685	SUSNJAR, ALEKSANDAR	
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Verbrugge	2188	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 03 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION.  R 1.136(a) and the approperties the fee. The appropriation of the fee in the final the f	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
<ul> <li>1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 2.</li> <li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be</li> </ul>	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
_ ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	•	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	••		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claim	s.
NOTE:			
$3. \square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: see		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: <u>16-18</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-15 and 1</u>	<u>9</u> .		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b)  disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen  10. Other:		Alprica	19-
10. Other:  BEST AVAILABLE	COPY ///our	Kevin Verbrugge Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2188	5

The response titled "Notice of Appeal and Response to Fourth Office Action" was received in the Office on 6/3/04 with a certificate of mailing dated 5/25/04, which is within two months of the date of mailing of the final Office action mailed 3/26/04. Therefore, the period for feply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action. So Applicant should use the mailing date of this Advisory Action to calculate any extension of time fees due when submitting an additional response. However, the statutory period for reply expires six months from the date of mailing of the final rejection (3/26/04), so the last day to file an additional response is 9/27/04 (the first business day on or after 9/26/04).

The Notice of Appeal and Response to Fourth Office Action is being considered as a Petition and Response to Fourth Action since the Applicant is "appealing" the restriction requirement and a restriction requirement is not appealable, rather it is petitionable. Therefore, the Notice of Appeal Regarding Election/Restriction is being considered as a Petition Regarding Election/Restriction. This matter will be decided by the Commissioner for Patents or one of his assigned representatives.

The remainder of the response includes three things:

- 1. claim amendments in response to claim objections
- 2. claim amendments in response to 35 USC 112 rejections and
- 3. arguments regarding the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections

The claim amendments of 1 and 2 will be entered because they are directed to formal matters. The arguments of 3 are a request for reconsideration. The arguments are not persuasive and therefore do not put the application in condition for allowance.

The argument that the "hard disk drive system" of claim 16 can only be a single hard disk drive is not persuasive. The definition of "system" provided on page 6 from the Meriam-Webster dictionary includes multiple definitions that make the interpretation of "hard disk drive system" reasonably include multiple hard disk drives. In the first example in the definition, number system includes multiple numbers. In the sixth example, telephone system includes multiple telephones. And in the seventh example, a highway system includes multiple highways. From these examples it is clear that a hard disk drive system can include multiple hard disk drives. The Applicant is reminded that the Examiner is required to give the claims the broadest reasonable interpretation, and that requires that the term "hard disk drive system" include multiple hard disk drives in a system.

The arguments regarding claim 18 are also not persuasive. The fact that two-way communication is not common is not evidence that it is not obvious to implement two-way communication with disk drives. The extra expense of enabling two-way communication and the generally sufficient data rates achievable with one-way communication may be the reason why hard drives commonly use two-way communication. But to the skilled artisan who desired faster data rates than one-way communication provides, it would have been obvious to use two-way communication to speed up the access time.